The Immaculate Identity

One morning Shri Maharaj, at the beginning of the session murmured: "What shall we talk about this morning. Most of the visitors had been here before and were quite content to let Shri Maharaj pick out a subject. Actually, as Shri Maharaj himself often says, he talks only on one subject and will not let the discussions stray away from that subject: our true nature or true identity. He again said it this morning, and promptly one of the visitors asked him if there is something which one could hang on to, so that he could be constantly conscious of his true identity.

Shri Maharaj laughed and said that that was the whole trouble: "some 'one' wants some 'thing' to which he could 'hang on to' in order to achieve something! Can you understand that the whole idea is misconceived? Actually, it is all very very simple, if you would only see it as it is. But it is not the usual seeing that is necessary: the usual kind of seeing - the seer seeing something - is totally inadequate. It needs a very special kind of seeing, an in-seeing wherein it is seen that there is no one to see that there is nothing to be seen!"

"No," he continued, "I am honestly not trying to confuse you. This subject itself is such: ephemeral, without substance, and yet so very much full of substance that no other subject can have any value beside it! I shall give you a formula which you can get hold of or hang on to, but it can only help you if you remember what I have told you about in-seeing. If you merely accept it as a formula, that is all you will get: the words of the mantra but not its meaning; the meaning of the mantra, not its efficacy. The real purpose of the Mantra is to return the sound to the source; the real purpose of the formula or

the Yaka-Vaakya is to surrender the seeing to Brahma.

" Remember always the immanent identity of THIS-THAT-I-AM and THAT-THAT-I-APPEAR-TO-BE Never for a moment forget that non-manifestation and manifestation, noumenon and phenomena, absolute and relative are not two different but identical. The manifestation is not a creation of the non-manifest but merely the minorisation, or an expression of it.

" In other words, there is no inherent duality between Subject and object; indeed no object could exist, even for a kshana, apart from its Subject, or vice versa. THIS-THAT-I-AM (Noumenon) obviously transcend THAT-THAT-I-APPEAR-TO-BE (Phenomena), but is immanent therein: there is inseparable identity between Noumenon and ~~X~~ ITS phenomena

" What happens in manifestation? Noumenally, I-AM and never for a kshana, do I cease to be ~~X~~ THIS-THAT-I-AM.; whereas phenomenally, I neither AM nor AM NOT because all objects are merely appearances in consciousness. Indeed, every single thing that one can cognise can only be an appearance in consciousness, and cannot have any other existence as such. And what is consciousness? 'I' am consciousness, and when 'mind' (which is nothing other than the content of consciousness) starts the process of objectifying, it can do so only through the process of duality, a dichotomy into subject and object, into inter-related counterparts and contrasts like pleasure and pain. (During this process, noumenally, intemporally, 'I' the purely subjective 'I', of course remains unsplit, whole, holy and eternal.) During this process of conceptualisation, in order to be cognisable, the appearances, the objects have to be given two notions, without which they would not be ~~for~~ sensorially perceptible: they would need to

be given shape or volume in space, and duration in time so that they could be cognized.

"If you can remain anchored in the immaculate identity between the Noumenon and its phenomena, which is your total potential, there cannot remain any basis for the imaginary bondage from which you want to be relieved. Your notion of bondage is just the illusion that you are autonomous ~~independent~~ entities subject to temporality. If, however, you appreciate your basic and essential identity, you cannot fail to see that the space-time element, the basis of the notion of bondage, is essentially only a contrivance ~~in order~~ to make sensorial perception of phenomena possible, and cannot, therefore, be anything independent as a means of bondage.

"Once again then, your manifestation is not 'illusory' ~~in the sense that~~ because, ~~it~~ it is the expression of non-manifestation which is immanent therein, but your mistaken identity with a particular phenomenon is certainly illusory.